

R E M A R K S

Claims 1, 2, 5 – 12, 18, 24, 30, and 31 are in the application. Claims 1, 24, and 30 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 5-12, 18, 24, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 7,000,015 (“Moore”). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 24, and 30

Amended independent claim one discloses a method comprising receiving a request from a second network device for a first network device connected to a network to look up location information. The request is contained in a first dynamic host configuration protocol message. The method further comprises determining the location information looked up by the first network device, storing the location information in a second dynamic host configuration protocol message, and sending the location information to the second network device in the second dynamic host configuration protocol message.

The art of record cannot be seen to disclose or to suggest storing location information in a dynamic host configuration protocol message and sending the location information to a network device in the dynamic host configuration protocol message.

Moore discloses a system and method for providing physical location information. However, the system in Moore, as stated in column 26, lines 34 – 50, delivers location information from a service associated with Microsoft’s Windows operating system to an application via a common API but nowhere does Moore disclose or even suggest that location information is stored **IN** a DHCP message.

The Office Action cites to specific locations in Moore that reference DHCP. Firstly, the Office Action cites to Column 10, lines 20 –61. This section discloses that a DHCP service will either request a DHCP renew or a DHCP discover. As well known in the art, a DHCP renew simply renews a lease (i.e. reservation) of an IP address and a DHCP discover message is a message sent by a client to discover what leases are available. However, nowhere does this section state that location information will be stored inside a DHCP discover message or a DHCP renew message.

Next, at column 26, line 51 through column 27, line 22 discloses how physical location information may be reported by the Network Location Resolution Service Provider (“NLRSP”). However, at column 13, lines 66-67, Moore states the NLRSP only uses DHCP for obtaining domain names of networks. Therefore, the DHCP packet does not disclose location information.

Therefore, nowhere can Moore be seen to disclose or to suggest storing the location information in a dynamic host configuration protocol message and sending the location information to a network device in the dynamic host configuration protocol message.

In view of the foregoing, amended independent claim 1 and its related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Amended independent claims 24 and 30 recite similar limitations. Therefore, amended independent claims 24 and 30 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 2

Amended dependent claim 2 discloses that the location information comprises a latitude and a longitude of the second device.

Moore, at column 26 lines 34 – 50, discloses that location information may be a latitude and longitude pair and may be “presented to applications via a common API” but does not disclose that the a latitude and longitude pair are stored in a dynamic host configuration protocol message.

In view of the foregoing, dependent claim 2 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

The outstanding Office Action presents a number of characterizations regarding the applied references, some of which are not directly addressed by this response. Applicants do not necessarily agree with the characterizations and reserve the right to further discuss those characterizations.

For at least the reasons given above, it is submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Alternatively, if there remains any question regarding the present application or any of the cited references, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-4982.

Respectfully submitted,

October 29, 2007
Date

/Richard S. Finkelstein/
Richard S. Finkelstein
Registration No. 56,534
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-4982